



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/601,850

06/24/2003

Toru Kambayashi

239513US2SRD

8096

22850

7590

06/25/2009

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

JONES, HEATHER RAE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/25/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/601,850	Applicant(s) KAMBAYASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner HEATHER R. JONES	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17,25-33 and 43-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17,25-33 and 43-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed March 10, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that Wistendahl fails to disclose the start time and end time of the moving visual object as well as failing to disclose "mask data". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wistendahl discloses in paragraphs [0032] and [0033] that the object mapping data includes the frame addresses as well as the pixel coordinates of where the object is in those frames. By providing the frame addresses that include the object it thereby discloses the start and end times that the object is reproduced because the frames are linked to display times. Furthermore the claim is broad enough to read the frames as being using to dictate the start and end times because the claim not limit the definition of the start and end times. Furthermore, the object mapping data includes the data for "hot spots" (masks) thereby meeting the limitation of including mask data. Therefore, Wistendahl meets the claimed limitations and the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2621

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-15, 25-32, and 43-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wistendahl et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0056136).

Regarding claim **1**, Wistendahl et al. discloses a video data reproduction apparatus comprising: a first determination unit configured to determine whether or not related information related to the moving visual object overlaid on video data contents is selected, the object related information including a start time at which the moving visual object appears in the video data contents and an end time at which the moving visual object disappears in the video data contents (Figs. 5B and 9 paragraphs [0032], [0033], [0053], [0097]); a first acquisition unit configured to acquire the start time and end time from the object related information, if the first determination unit determines that the object related information is selected (paragraphs [0032], [0033], [0053] and [0054]); and a reproduction unit configured to reproduce the moving visual object and the video data contents from the start time to the end time (Fig. 4 – reproduction unit; Figs. 5B and 9 paragraphs [0032], [0033], [0053], [0097]).

Regarding claim **2**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as the apparatus

further comprising a mask unit configured to mask a mask area except for the moving visual object (Fig. 5A – paragraph [0049]).

Regarding claim **3**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 2 including that the mask unit comprises a second acquisition unit configured to acquire mask data, the mask data containing mask start time for masking the mask area and mask end time for masking the mask area (Fig. 5A; paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).

Regarding claim **4**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as the apparatus further comprising a balloon unit configured to display such a balloon on the moving visual object (paragraph [0097]).

Regarding claim **5**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the object related information data further contains identification information for identifying the moving visual object, and the first acquisition unit acquiring the start time referring to the identification information (Figs. 5B and 5C; paragraphs [0053] and [0054]).

Regarding claim **6**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 2 including that the start time and the identification information are prepared in each moving visual object (Figs. 5B and 5C; paragraphs [0053] and [0054]).

Regarding claim **7**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the reproduction unit comprises a third acquisition unit configured to acquire object data indicative of movement of the moving visual object (Fig. 5C; paragraph [0054]).

Regarding claim **8**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 including that the object data contains shape data indicative of shapes of the moving visual object at a plurality of points in time during a certain period of time (Fig. 5C; paragraph [0054]).

Regarding claim **9**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 including that the object data contains order data for determining an order in which a plurality of moving visual objects are superposed if the plurality of moving visual objects appear in the video data contents (as can be seen from Fig 9 - different objects are superposed over other ones and to do this correctly the object data has to contain the order).

Regarding claim **10**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 including that the object data contains balloon data indicative of information related to a balloon image (paragraph [0097]).

Regarding claim **11**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 as well as the

apparatus further comprising a waiting unit configured to keep the object data in a waiting state in which the moving visual object can be reproduced, the reproduction unit reproducing the object data kept in the waiting state, if the first determination unit determines that the object related information is selected (Figs. 4 and 9; [0040] and [0097]).

Regarding claim **12**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the reproduction unit comprises: a fourth acquisition unit configured to acquire a present reproduction time of the video data contents; and a reproduction unit configured to reproduce of the moving visual object when the reproduction time reaches the start time (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim **13**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as the apparatus further comprising: a designation unit configured to designate a space-time position in the video data contents, the space-time position being determined from a time and a position; a second determination unit configured to determine whether or not the space-time position is positioned in the moving visual object; and an execution unit configured to execute a particular processing if the second determination unit determines that the space-time position is positioned in the moving visual object (Figs. 5A and 5B; paragraphs [0048]-[0053]).

Regarding claim **14**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 13 including that the

execution unit executes the particular processing including jumping to a certain linked page (paragraphs [0084] and [0097]).

Regarding claim **15**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 13 including that the execution unit executes the particular processing including a processing related to the moving visual object (Fig. 4).

Regarding claims **25-32**, these are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 1-4, 7, and 11-13. Therefore, claims 25-32 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-4, 7, and 11-13.

Regarding claim **43**, Wistendahl et al. discloses a video data reproduction apparatus which reproduces moving visual object, the moving visual object being overlaid on video data contents, the video data reproduction apparatus comprising: a first acquisition unit configured to acquire schedule data which includes a start time at which the moving visual object appears in the video data contents and an end time at which the moving visual object disappears in the video data contents (Figs. 5A-5C; paragraphs [0049]-[0054]); a first acquisition unit configured to acquire schedule data which includes a start time and the end time at which the object appears in the video data contents (Fig. 5B – paragraph [0053]); a second acquisition unit configured to acquire the start time from the schedule data (Figs. 5A-5C; paragraphs [0049]-[0054]); and a reproduction unit configured to reproduce the moving visual object and the

Art Unit: 2621

video data contents from the start time and the end time (Fig. 4 – reproduction unit).

Regarding claims **44-57**, grounds for rejecting claims 2-15 apply to claims 44-57 in their entirety.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 16, 17, 33, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wistendahl et al. as applied to claims 1 and 25 above, and further in view of Minor et al. (U.S. Patent 5,740,252).

Regarding claim **16**, Wistendahl et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the apparatus is associated with a server, further comprising: a connection unit configured to connect the apparatus to the server which distributes display data related to a display of the video data contents (Fig. 3; paragraph [0084]). However, Wistendahl et al. fails to disclose a certification unit configured to perform a certification between the apparatus and the server; a third determination unit configured to determine whether or not the certification has succeeded; a fifth acquisition unit configured to acquire the display

data from the server if the determination unit determines that the certification has succeeded; and a fourth determination unit configured to determine whether or not the display data should be certified.

Referring to the Minor et al. reference, Minor et al. discloses an apparatus connected to a server further comprising: a connection unit configured to connect the apparatus to the server which distributes display data related to a display of the video data contents; a certification unit configured to perform a certification between the apparatus and the server; a third determination unit configured to determine whether or not the certification has succeeded; a fifth acquisition unit configured to acquire the display data from the server if the determination unit determines that the certification has succeeded; and a fourth determination unit configured to determine whether or not the display data should be certified (Fig. 6; col. 7, line 58 – col. 8, line 23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the apparatus disclosed by Wistendahl et al. by including security information when accessing a server as disclosed by Minor et al. in order to protect the data being transmitted as well as the apparatus reproducing the data being transmitted.

Regarding claim **17**, Wistendahl et al. in view of Minor et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 16 including that the display data is at least one of the object related

data, object data indicative of movement of the object, and mask data containing mask start time for masking a mask area and mask end time for masking the mask area (Wistendahl et al.: Figs. 4 and 9).

Regarding claim **33**, this is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 16. Therefore, claim 33 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 16.

Regarding claims **58** and **59**, grounds for rejecting claims 16 and 17 apply to claims 58 and 59 in their entirety.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2621

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HEATHER R. JONES whose telephone number is (571)272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm, and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Heather R Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 2621

HRJ
June 19, 2009

/Thai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621